

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Michael Davitt,

Case No. 23-cv-3401 (DWF/DJF)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Chatholic Charities et al,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Michael Davitt’s Motion for costs of copies of previous complaints (“Motion”) (ECF No. 6). The Motion requests “cost amount of copies of prior 2 complaints on this issue” so that he can review them to respond to the Court’s Order to Show Cause (*see* ECF No. 3). But the *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) statute does not authorize payment of copy costs for exhibit-only filings, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915; *Mendez v. Kallis*, 20-cv-0924 (ECT/ECW), 2020 WL 2573232, at *2 (D. Minn. Apr. 20, 2020) (collecting cases applying section 1915 to non-prisoner plaintiffs), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2020 WL 2572524 (D. Minn. May 21, 2020), *aff’d*, , 2020 WL 7253502 (8th Cir. Sept. 18, 2020); *Walker v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 1:11-cv-01317 (JHH), 2012 WL 4711898, at *2 (N.D. Ala. Sept. 27, 2012) (noting that section 1915 makes no provision for litigation expenses other than the reproduction of case records and transcripts), and Plaintiff offers no other legal basis for prepayment of costs. Moreover, Plaintiff’s IFP Application remains pending, and Plaintiff will not be entitled to reimbursement for any costs under the IFP statute unless and until his application is granted. Finally, the Court notes that the requested information (prior complaints) is unlikely to be responsive to the Court’s Order to Show Cause, which requests that he submit specific allegations regarding his out-of-pocket costs

for any medical bills he paid in connection with his claims against Defendants (*see* ECF No. 3).

The Court accordingly denies Mr. Davitt's Motion.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 24, 2024

s/ Dulce J. Foster

Dulce J. Foster

United States Magistrate Judge